## UNPUBLISHED

# UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

## FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

JASON A. COPSON, a/k/a Scott E. Berry,
Petitioner-Appellant,

No. 98-7832

V.

VIRGINIA PAROLE BOARD, Respondent-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. T.S. Ellis, III, District Judge. (CA-98-1388-AM)

Submitted: May 31, 2000

Decided: September 12, 2000

Before NIEMEYER, LUTTIG, and WILLIAMS, Circuit Judges.

Vacated and remanded by unpublished per curiam opinion.

### COUNSEL

Jason A. Copson, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

### **OPINION**

### PER CURIAM:

Jason Copson appeals the district court's order dismissing as untimely a pro se petition that he labeled as filed under 28 U.S.C.A. § 2254 (West 1994 & Supp. 2000). We find that the court should have construed Copson's petition as one filed under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (West 1994). Because § 2241 petitions are not subject to the one-year time limitation period prescribed by 28 U.S.C.A.§ 2244(d)(1) (West 1994 & Supp. 2000), we conclude the district court erroneously dismissed Copson's petition as untimely filed. Because reasonable jurists would find it debatable whether Copson made a substantial showing of the a denial of a constitutional right in his § 2241 petition, we grant a certificate of appealability as to whether Copson was deprived of due process in the execution of his sentence. See Slack v. McDaniel, 120 S. Ct. 1595 (2000); 28 U.S.C.A. § 2253(c) (West Supp. 2000). We further vacate the district court's order and remand the case for the court to consider the merits of Copson's claims under § 2241. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

### VACATED AND REMANDED

2